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Author’s response to reviews:

Reponse to Reviewer 2

First of all, we would like to thank you for the relevant reading work you have done. Thank you for your comments that allowed us to rework our article. These comments will also help us in our future work. Please find in the yellow sections our answers to your questions and comments. Good reception

Reviewer #2: Overall: I appreciate the way in which the authors incorporated feedback from the first round of review, and think that this manuscript is much improved with a more clear message and most importantly, a set of lessons from your work that can be conveyed to others who will plan to implement a similar program and/or who plan to use CFIR in future implementation studies. My specific comments are included below:

Background

-Line 4 should read ""has increased"
Reponse : The correction was made as indicated

-Lines 6-8 read a bit odd; I believe this is a list of local initiatives; so why then the Chennai example? Or there are community-based initiatives? The word local somehow didn't work - and the line ""impact on..."" also didn't seem to be part of a list of programs/initiatives
Reponse : The correction was made.

-Line 13: you are also assessing the challenges, in addition to successes, yes? I would add challenges in.
Reponses : This part has been corrected taking into account your comments. As we did not have information on the challenges related to these initiatives, we were unable to do so.

-Line 26 - could you add in the date of the initiative launch?"
Reponse : The program was implemented in June 2016. The date has been added to line 25
Methods

Context

In the response for the question posed "Can you describe who the facilitators are? Also what is the monitoring committee" you helped me as a reader by inserting a response into the feedback to the reviewer, but did not add into the text. I think this response should be added to the manuscript so all readers understand this contextual piece.
Response: Your suggestion has been taken into account in the «Study Population». The explanatory note sent to you has been added to the text in yellow.

Conceptual framework
I think even if you are developing another paper for IS on the exclusive of certain components of CFIR you can still add one or two lines stating this briefly (why they were not relevant omitted them)
Response: At the end of this section we have added the following two sentences to take your suggestion into account "The absence of empirical data for some constructs (i.e. relative advantage) did not allow them to be retained. For others, we do not have sufficient data to analyze them"

Study Population
Again I think the text you used here to explain to the reviewer would be helpful added into the narrative --the piece on "All those involved in the implementation of the intervention....." even though you did make some changes on page 4.
Response: The text has been added at this point
- Line 26 you state that no specific criteria were used, but you did actually have some basic criteria that you listed in the response in terms of who was involved"
Same comments for "Our first step was to get...." - best to add this in too. If I had the question as a reviewer, I think other readers will benefit by having this information.
Response: In fact, only one criterion was used to select participants: to be a member of the intervention implementation team. The correction was made in the text.

Results

Is it true that you used the scores as a ranking activity to then prompt the study participants to discuss the concepts? That is the way I am reading it now, but I think this could be stated more explicitly.
1.2 (Line 35) I am still not convinced this is addressing the concept of quality and strength of the evidence - the first line seems to imply that participants felt this strategy was better in comparison to others they have seen (mass spraying) - but why? Why did they have positive view of this program as it relates to any evidence they would have about how it should work - are there features of other programs that led them to believe features of this program would work? The evidence can certainly be anecdotal, or from their past experience, but this link isn't fully clear to me. (e.g. when you talk about knowledge and skills they acquired - is this as a result of the program? Or previously? Maybe this was not an important construct, but right now was written I get a little lost in the explanation.
Reponse : After reading your comment and our analysis of the concept « quality and strength of the evidence », we agree with you that the analytical perspective used in the text is not the right one. As we do not have adequate data for analysis, we decide to subtract this construct from the article. We will discuss the analysis of this construct in our next article. Thank you for the relevance of your comment

Discussion

Overall: I think the discussion has improved pieces, but could be simplified a bit to avoid repeating statements made previously (as commented in the line above). You reflect on what you learned, how it relates to other findings, and then how this can be useful--and that structure in general works well. I also really like your final conclusion.

Line 12- I am not sure what you mean by ""We are at the heart of…"" and have a hard time relating this to the point you are trying to make."
Reponse : This sentence has been reworded(See Page 9, line 15)

Line 20-21 "AS the actors…” is an incomplete thought/sentence.
Reponse : This sentence has been corrected. She becomes" The actors of the intervention did not feel an exaggerated sense of complexity in relation to the intervention to be implemented”( See Discussion Line 16).

Line 50-51 - What does "of this intervention will of leaders…” mean? Needs some editing.
Reponse : To make this part of the article more comprehensible to readers, we have deleted these sentences“Thanks to this first community intervention in West Africa, the key factors to consider are, as in other contexts for combating dengue fever, the empowerment of communities and actors involved in the intervention, as well as the networking of this intervention will of leaders and external partnerships. These three essential elements echo the literature on the effectiveness of health promotion”

Line 11-12 last page: you sa the key is not to design an intervention properly --I think what you mean is not to JUST design an appropriate intervention but ALSO to…
Reponse : This sentence has been corrected. It becomes :"The key is not to just design an intervention properly and mobilize financial resources, but also to put in place appropriate implementation strategies that take into account the intervention environment”.
(See Page 10, Line 2-3)